

1
2
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

4 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

5 * * *

6 KEON-MICHAEL WILLIAMS, *et al.*,

Case No. 3:22-cv-00164-MMD-CLB

7 Plaintiffs,

ORDER

8 v.

9 NEVADA HIGHWAY PATROL, *et al.*,10 Defendants.
11

12 *Pro se* Plaintiffs Keon-Michael Williams, Robert Walker, and Quentin Gibson bring
13 this action against Defendants Nevada Highway Patrol, Jesse Cornett, K. Itskin, and
14 Fallon Police Department under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (ECF No. 1-1.) Before the Court is the
15 Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) of United States Magistrate Judge Carla L. Baldwin
16 (ECF No. 8), recommending that the Court deny Plaintiffs’ applications to proceed *in*
17 *forma pauperis* (“IFP Applications”) (ECF Nos. 1, 5, 6, 7) as moot, and dismiss the
18 Complaint (ECF No. 1-1) without prejudice. Objections to the R&R were due July 29,
19 2022. To date, no objection has been filed. For this reason, and as explained below, the
20 Court adopts the R&R in full.

21 The Court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or
22 recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party
23 fails to object to a magistrate judge’s recommendation, the Court is not required to
24 conduct “any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection.” *Thomas*
25 *v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); *see also United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114,
26 1116 (9th Cir. 2003) (“De novo review of the magistrate judges’ findings and
27 recommendations is required if, but *only* if, one or both parties file objections to the
28 findings and recommendations.”) (emphasis in original); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72, Advisory

1 Committee Notes (1983) (providing that the Court “need only satisfy itself that there is no
2 clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.”).

3 Because there were no objections, the Court need not conduct de novo review,
4 and is satisfied that Judge Baldwin did not clearly err. Judge Baldwin correctly found that
5 *pro se* Plaintiffs may not proceed jointly in this lawsuit without the representation of
6 licensed counsel. (ECF No. 8 at 4.) See *Martinez v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court*, 729 P.2d
7 487, 488 (Nev. 1986); *Salman v. Newell*, 885 P.2d 607, 608 (Nev. 1994); *Russell v. United*
8 *States*, 308 F.2d 78, 79 (9th Cir. 1962); *Simon v. Hartford Life, Inc.*, 546 F.3d 661, 665
9 (9th Cir. 2008). However, each *pro se* Plaintiff may pursue his claims in his own, separate
10 action. Accordingly, the Court will dismiss Plaintiffs’ Complaint (ECF No. 1-1) without
11 prejudice, and deny Plaintiffs’ IFP Applications (ECF Nos. 1, 5, 6, 7) as moot.

12 It is therefore ordered that Judge Baldwin’s Report and Recommendation (ECF
13 No. 8) is accepted and adopted in full.

14 It is further ordered that Plaintiffs’ IFP Applications are denied as moot. (ECF Nos.
15 1, 5, 6, 7.)

16 It is further ordered that this case is dismissed without prejudice.

17 The Clerk of Court is directed to file the Complaint (ECF No. 1-1).

18 The Clerk of Court is directed to enter judgment accordingly and close this case.
19 No other documents may be filed in this now-closed case.

20 DATED THIS 29th Day of August 2022.

21 
22 _____
23 MIRANDA M. DU
24 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
25
26
27
28